

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 12, 14-23, and 25-27 are pending. Claim 11 has been canceled without prejudice.

The title has been objected to as being non-descriptive. The title is hereby amended. The specification is also amended to replace previously unpublished application numbers with the issued patent numbers, and to correct minor informalities. No new matter is added thereby.

The Examiner has indicated the allowability of the claims, if rewritten to overcome certain claim objections involving informalities. Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful review of the claims, and Applicants have attempted to address other antecedent basis issues not identified by the Examiner. Applicants have addressed most of these claim objections via the claim amendments correcting antecedent basis issues. Claim 1 has been amended in steps c1, c2 and d, as well as clarifying the “initiation” in steps c and d. Claim 2 has been amended in step e. Claim 6 has been amended in steps e and f. Claim 12 has been amended in steps a and c. Claim 16 has been amended in step d. Claim 17 has been amended in steps a and d. Claim 21 has been amended in step e. Claim 23 has been amended in steps a and c. Claim 25 has been amended in step d.

Applicants also attempt to address particular objections to claims 7, 11, and 16 as follows.

Claim 7 was objected to as failing to further limit the steps of the invention of claim 1. The Examiner indicated that claim 1 sets forth that the normalization is automatic, which is inherently free of user input (claim 7). Applicants respectfully note that although the recited normalization of step c may be done automatically, such automatic normalization could be done either in response to a user input (e.g., pressing a button) or as a function of time or a detected event or a triggering event (e.g., in response to a quantification procedure initiation or a transmission of acoustic energy for destroying contrast agents), as indicated in the specification at least in paragraphs 28 and 45. Claim 1 is therefore believed to be broader than claim 7, which does limit claim 1.

Claim 16 was objected to as lacking antecedent basis in step b2 which recites “contrast agent intensity values” instead of “the contrast agent intensity values”. Claim 16, which is

dependent on claim 12, recites “contrast agent intensity values” for the first time and has not been amended to recite “the contrast agent intensity values”.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks early allowance thereof.

PLEASE MAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Siemens Corporation
Customer No. 28524
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

Respectfully submitted,
/Rosa S. Kim/

Rosa S. Kim, Reg. No. 39,728
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)
Telephone: 650-694-5330
Date: Jan. 5, 2009_____